APPENDIX B CHECKLIST TABLES

Table B-1. SOW Preparation Checklist

Proj MM Prep	ect Name: ect Location: DC Representative parer's Name and Title:			
Date	e of Preparation:			
<u>Al</u>	l SOWs	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
1.	Has the authorization and funding been received for SOW preparation?			
2.	Has the MM-DC DC held pre-scoping meeting with PDT to discuss project requirements and to determine required resources?			
3.	Have project requirements been identified through interfacing with the PM?			
4.	Do the personnel responsible for preparing the SOW have a detailed knowledge of the project history, site conditions, and characteristics of MEC and MC anticipated and of geophysical methods?			
5.	Has existing site information been provided to the PDT (may include ASR, previous site investigation reports, information from site visits, information from district contractors that have worked on the site in the past, etc.)?			
6.	Have the requirements for the site visit been met (i.e., right of entry, ASSHP, etc see Chapter 3 of this manual)?			
7.	Have Federal, state and local regulatory requirements been identified in the SOW?			
8.	Has an appropriate schedule been included in the SOW?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
9. Has the MM CX reviewed the SOW when required by ER 1110-1-8153?			
10. Are the following general topics included in the SOW:			
• General responsibilities of the contractor?			
• Project description?			
• Scope of services?			
• Schedule and deliverables?			
• Reviews and conferences?			
 Technical criteria and standards, including government furnished information? 			
 Administrative instructions? 			
• General provisions?			
• References?			
11. Have review comments been obtained from appropriate personnel, including PM and PDT members, IAW ER 1110-1-8153?			
12. Has the SOW been approved IAW ER 1110-1-8153 and has the final SOW been submitted to the CO?			
13. Has an external review of the SOW been performed?			
14. If the SOW is prepared for a removal action, did it clearly identify if the contractor is responsible for the preparation of an ESS?			
SOW for RI/FS			
1. Have the following typical tasks, as applicable, been included in the RI/FS SOW:			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
•	Records review and land restriction assessment?			
•	Project Work Plan including SSHP (see Chapter 3 of this manual)?			
•	Site preparation?			
•	Site characterization (see Chapters 5 and 6 of this manual)?			
•	Environmental Sampling?			
•	Customer's safety and public risk assessment (see Chapter 9 of this manual)?			
•	Preparation of the RI/FS report?			
•	Preparation of the Action Memorandum/ Record of Decision?			
•	Community relations?			
•	Maintain Administrative Record?			
•	TPP?			
•	Scheduling?			
	e SOW in compliance with the Approval orandum?			
•	Site visit (see Chapter 3 of this manual)?			
•	Work Plan development (see Chapter 4 of this manual)?			
•	Location surveying and mapping (see Chapters 5 and 8 of this manual)?			
•	Site preparation (see Chapter 6 of this manual)?			
•	Geophysical investigation prove-out (see Chapter 6 of this manual)?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
• Geophysical investigation (see Chapter 6 of this manual)?			
 Anomaly reacquisition (see Chapter 6 of this manual)? 			
• Remedial action?			
• LUC activities and recurring reviews?			
• Scrap turn-in?			
SOW for EE/CA			
1. Have the following typical tasks, as applicable, been included in the EE/CA SOW:			
 Records review and land restriction assessment? 			
 Project Work Plan including SSHP and Institutional Analysis Plan (see Chapter 3 of this manual)? 			
• Site preparation?			
• Site characterization (see Chapters 5 and 6 of this manual)?			
• Environmental Sampling?			
• Customer's safety and public risk evaluation (see Chapter 9 of this manual)?			
• Preparation of the EE/CA report?			
 Preparation of the Action Memorandum/Decision Document? 			
• Community relations?			
Maintain Administrative Record?			
• TPP?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
	• Scheduling?			
2.	Is the SOW in compliance with the Approval Memorandum?			
	• Site visit (see Chapter 3 of this manual)?			
	• Work Plan development (see Chapter 4 of this manual)?			
	• Location surveying and mapping (see Chapters 5 and 8 of this manual)?			
	• Site preparation (see Chapter 6 of this manual)?			
	 Geophysical investigation prove-out (see Chapter 6 of this manual)? 			
	 Geophysical investigation (see Chapter 6 of this manual)? 			
	 Anomaly reacquisition (see Chapter 6 of this manual)? 			
	• Removal action?			
	• LUC activities and recurring reviews?			
	• Scrap turn-in?			
	• Preparation of site-specific removal report?			
	• Is the SOW in compliance with the Action Memorandum?			
	• Site visit (see Chapter 3 of this manual)?			
	• Work Plan development (see Chapter 4 of this manual)?			
	• Location surveying and mapping (see Chapters 5 and 8 of this manual)?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
• Site preparation (see Chapter 6 of this manual)?			
• Geophysical investigation prove-out (see Chapter 6 of this manual)?			
• Geophysical investigation (see Chapter 6 of this manual)?			
• Anomaly reacquisition (see Chapter 6 of this manual)?			
• Removal action?			
• LUC activities and recurring reviews?			
• Scrap turn-in?			
• Preparation of site-specific removal report?			
3. Is the SOW in compliance with the Action Memorandum?			
SOW for GDS			
1. Has the GDS task in the SOW been prepared by PDT personnel with a detailed knowledge of project history, site conditions, site-specific data requirements and location survey and mapping methodologies?			
2. Does the SOW specify the GDS to be used on the project:			
 Were the systems currently utilized by the MM CX, MM DC, district, project sponsor and stakeholders considered in choosing the project GDS? 			
 Will the chosen system avoid production of geospatial data in multiple formats for distribution or use? 			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
	 Will the chosen system accomplish the current mission but also allow for future reuse or use of the geospatial data by others without translation? 			
3.	Does the SOW specify the spatial coordinate reference system to be used?			
4.	Is the chosen spatial coordinate reference system compatible with the existing district or project sponsor GDS activities?			
5.	Does the SOW state that all GDS activities should be managed by a qualified GIS manager with a minimum of 3 years direct experience managing geospatial data systems within the system environment to be used for the project (e.g., ArcInfo, ArcView, or Microstation MGE)?			
6.	Does the SOW state that all surveying and mapping activities must be conducted under the responsible charge of a Registered or Professional Land Surveyor registered and/or licensed in the state in which the work will be conducted?			
7.	Does the SOW state that the Field Surveyor assigned to the project must have a minimum of 5 years experience as a Survey Party Chief?			
8.	Does the SOW require that a qualified UXO Technician II accompany the Field Surveyor at all times, unless it is decided by the UXO Technician II and the OE Safety Specialist that the UXO Technician II is not required?			
9.	Does the SOW state that the contractor must follow the safety requirements in EM 385-1-1?			
10.	Does the SOW specify the requirements for control point establishment?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
11. Does the SOW state the specifications for monument caps and monument identification?			
12. Does the SOW give procedures for plotting the control points?			
13. Does the SOW give requirements for grid corner establishment?			
14. Does the SOW state that the Registered Land Surveyor/Professional Land Surveyor should sign drawings that contain boundaries, legal descriptions, or parcel location information?			
15. Does the SOW prescribe the units to be used for recording and plotting location survey and mapping activities, as specified by the district or customer? (note: units of measure – 1 US survey foot = 0.3048006096 meters)			
16. Does the SOW require that location surveys be connected to existing local, state or national control monuments and reference d to an appropriately recognized installation, local state, or worldwide coordinate system as specified by the PDT?			
17. Does the SOW specify the minimum acceptable accuracy standards for positional data for project control markers (i.e., monuments, benchmarks)?			
18. Is densification of the existing project control markers required?			
19. If densification of existing project control markers is required, is this specified in the SOW?			
20. Does the SOW specify that at least two existing markers will be used as a baseline for the project geospatial coordinate reference system?			
21. Has the PDT specified acceptable limits of error in			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
	terms of accuracy and precision based on the nature and purpose of each location surveying and mapping activity or product?			
22.	Has the PDT developed site-specific standards for the format, transfer and storage of all location surveying and mapping data? (including digital data collector (raw) files)			
23.	Does the SOW specify that Tri-Service CADD/GIS Technology Center SDSFIE standard will be used for all deliverables?			
24.	Does the SOW specify additional site-specific standards developed by the PDT for the format, transfer, and storage of all geospatial data consistent with EM 1110-1-2909?			
25.	Were the following factors considered by the PDT when developing site-specific standards:			
	• Compatibility with selected GDS without modification or additional software?			
	 Format of existing digital data and geospatial referenced mapping? 			
	 Usability by all parties of concern including stakeholders? 			
26.	Does the SOW prescribe the units to be used in recording and plotting geospatial data, as specified by the district or project sponsor? (note: transformation between datums and coordinate systems may be based on different programs (e.g., CORPSCON, Blue Marble, Geosoft) and small differences in the final coordinates may occur because of this.			
27.	Does the SOW specify the minimum acceptable limits for accuracy and precision based on the nature			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
and purpose of	of the GDS?			
activities and	W require contractor QC of GDS products, including independent tests eriodically reviewed by the			
control and ri	established the level of production gor with which quality assessments e consistent with the project-specific ments?			
30. Are the follow	wing deliverables specified in the SOW:			
the en	de items created and/or used to create d products and the narrative and ption required?			
	al data in the media as specified in the along with all other supporting files?			
all pro outsid detern associ	manual as an ASCII file documenting oduction and work files necessary for an ler to recreate all products and nine the location, names, structures and lations of the data, such as layer ption, file references (as appropriate),			
-	eleted monument descriptions (as part of atabase or spreadsheet).			
the en	de items created and/or used to create d products and the narrative and ption required?			
• Requi	red location, project and grid maps?			
aerial	egatives and three sets of prints of the photographs taken for the project, if photography is required in the SOW?			

Two hard copies of each final map and two copies of the digital data delivered to the MM DC?

Table B-2. Cost Estimate Preparation Checklist

Pro	oject Name:			
Pro	oject Location:			
Μì	M DC Representative:			
Pre	eparer's Name and Title:			
Da	te of Preparation:			
		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Pr</u>	ior to beginning work on cost estimate			
1.	Is the cost estimate being prepared for internal budgetary purposes (i.e., to obtain program funding)? If yes, a rough order of magnitude estimate may be prepared.			
2.	Is the cost estimate being prepared for contract procurement (i.e., for use in contract negotiations)? If yes, a detailed cost estimate is required.			
3.	Has the SOW been developed and approved?			
4.	Have the phase of the project and the following items that will impact the project's cost been considered (this list is not all inclusive):			
	Note: This checklist is only to be used to show whether items have been considered in the estimate, and not as a cost worksheet.			
	• Size of areas of concern?			
	• Site risk?			
	• Type of MEC?			
	• Soil type?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
•	Topography?			
•	Vegetation type?			
•	MEC density?			
•	Required removal depth?			
•	Amount of munitions debris?			
•	MC Sampling Analyses?			
•	Special environmental and safety concerns (e.g., presence of CWM, requirements for engineering controls, sampling and analysis requirements such as air monitoring, etc.)?			
•	Production rates?			
•	In-house or contracted?			
•	Percent of property to be investigated?			
•	Surveying methods?			
•	Data format requirements (i.e., digital or non-digital)?			
•	PPE level required?			
•	Type of operation to be performed (e.g., search only or search and recovery)?			
•	Number and type of UXO technicians required?			
•	Equipment and vehicles required (e.g., magnetometer, towed array, earth moving machinery, recovery vehicles)?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
•	Expected time duration?			
•	Access restrictions?			
•	Political considerations?			
•	Start date?			

Table B-3. Site Visit Review Checklist

Project Name:				
Project Location:				
MM DC Representative:				
Reviewer's Name and Title:				
Date of Review:				
	<u>Y</u>	N	N/A	
	<u> </u>	11	14/11	
General.				
1. Will the initial site visit be a:				
• Government site visit?				
• Contractor site visit?				
 Combined government and contractor site visit? 				
Government Site Visit Attendees.				
1. Are the following personnel attending the government site visit:				
• PM (optional)?				
• MM DC Representative(s) (optional)?				
• OE Safety Specialist?				
• Project Engineers (optional)?				
• Cost estimator (optional)?				
• Project Geophysicist (optional)?				

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
	* Government geophysicist may bring along geophysical equipment to assess the capabilities of different instrumentation at the site.			
	 Project Chemist (optional - applies primarily to sites with significant MC concerns)? 			
Co	ontractor Site Visit Attendees.			
1.	Are the following personnel, at a minimum, attending the contractor site visit:			
	• Contractor PM?			
	• Contractor UXO Technician III?			
	• Project Geophysicist (optional)?			
	• PM (government) (optional*)?			
	• MM DC Representative (optional*)?			
	• OE Safety Specialist (optional*)?			
	 Project Chemist (optional - applies primarily to sites with significant MC concerns)? 			
	* One PDT representative, at a minimum, is required to accompany the contractor during the site visit.			
2.	Has the PM determined that the contractor is limited to a certain number of personnel to attend the site visit? (If yes, state maximum number allowable.)			
3.	Has the PM confirmed that the contractor personnel are qualified IAW USACE Personnel/Work Standards?			
	te Visit Requirements. Prior to the site visit, the PDT ould ensure that the following requirements are			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
fulfilled:				
•	Have site-specific reports been reviewed?			
•	Have any data gaps in the existing site data been identified?			
•	Has the PM obtained rights of entry, if applicable?			
	Has the PDT ensured that an ASSHP has been and approved prior to the site visit?			

Table B-4. Work Plan Review Checklist

Pro	ject Name:			
Pro	ject Location:			
	A DC Representative:			
Rev	viewer's Name and Title:			
Dat	te of Review:			
		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
G	<u>eneral</u>			
1.	Have the following PDT members, at a minimum, reviewed the Work Plan:			
	• PM?			
	• MM DCDC?			
	 Project engineers in relevant subject matter areas? 			
	OE Safety Specialist?			
	• Industrial Hygienist?			
	• Cost Engineer?			
	• Project Geophysicist?			
	• Project Chemist?			
2.	Is the Work Plan in compliance with the project SOW?			
3.	Is the Work Plan in compliance with contract requirements?			
W	ork Plan Checklist			
	The PDT will ensure that the Work Plan has been repared IAW the SOW and contract specifications. The York Plan will generally include the following chapters:			
	Project purpose and scope?			
	• Work plan organization?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
• Project location?			
• Site description, including site location, topography, climate, vegetation, and site geology?			
• Site history?			
Current and projected land use?			
• Summary of previous site investigations?			
• Fill Information for anticipated MEC?			
• Initial summary of MEC risk at the site?			
 Risk Assessment Subplan (for MC risk assessments conducted with RI/FSs)? 			
2. Technical Management Plan. Are the following topics discussed in this chapter:			
Project objectives?			
Project organization?			
• Project personnel?			
Project communication and reporting?			
• Deliverables?			
• Schedule?			
• Periodic Reporting?			
Costing and billing?			
• Public relations support?			
• Subcontractor management procedures?			
• Field operation management procedures?			
Data Management Procedures?			
• DQOs?			
3. Field Investigation Plan. Are the following topics discussed in this chapter:			
• Overall Approach?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
• Identification of Areas of Concern?			
• Location Surveys and Mapping Plan?			
• Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Plan?			
• Geophysical Prove-out Plan and Report?			
• Geophysical Investigation Plan?			
• Intrusive Investigation. Does this subchapter discuss the planning and implementation of the following:			
General methodology?			
– MEC accountability and record management?			
– UXO personnel and qualifications?			
– MEC sampling locations?			
– MEC sampling procedures?			
 Munition with the Greatest Fragmentation Distance (MGFD)? 			
Minimum separation distances (MSDs)?			
– MEC identification?			
– MEC removal?			
– MEC storage?			
– MEC disposal procedures?			
– MEC disposal alternatives?			
• Investigation Derived Waste Plan?			
• Risk Characterization and Analysis?			
• Analysis of Land Use Controls?			
• Preparation of Recurring Review Plan?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
4.	Quality Control Plan.			
	 Does this chapter adequately discuss quality control procedures for the munitions response project? 			
5.	Explosives Management Plan.			
	 Does this chapter describe how demolition explosives will be managed, planned and implemented during MEC operations? 			
6.	Explosives Siting Plan.			
	• Does this chapter adequately describe the safety criteria for siting explosives operations at the site?			
7.	Environmental Protection Plan.			
	• Is a list of potential applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) provided?			
	• Is an initial determination provided as to the actual applicability of these ARARs to the project?			
	• Is the procedure by which ARARs will be identified and complied with during field investigation activities described?			
	• Does the EPP note that evaluation of ARARs is an iterative process to be performed throughout the life of the project?			
	 Does the EPP detail the identification and location of, as well as provide procedures and methods to protect and/or mitigate resources/sites of all known: 			
	 Endangered/threatened species within the project site? 			
	– Wetlands within the project site?			
	 Cultural, archaeological, and water resources within the project site? 			
	 Coastal zones within the project site? 			

8.

9.

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
	 Trees and shrubs that will be removed within the project site? 			
	 Existing waste disposal sites within the project site? 			
•	Does the EPP include a description of the joint environmental survey conducted prior to the start of any on-site work by the contractor and CO/COR or other government personnel?			
•	Does the EPP detail mitigation procedures for the following:			
	 All manifesting, transportation, and disposal of wastes? 			
	All burning activities?			
	Dust and emission control?			
	 Spill control and prevention? 			
	 All storage areas and temporary facilities? 			
	– Access routes?			
	– Trees and shrubs protection and restoration?			
	 Control of water run-on and run-off? 			
	– Decontamination and disposal of equipment?			
	– Minimization of areas of disturbance?			
•	Does the EPP describe procedures for post-activity clean up to be accomplished?			
Pr	operty Management Plan.			
•	Does this chapter detail procedures for the management of government property in accordance with FAR Part 45.5 and its supplements?			
Int	terim Holding Facility Siting Plan.			
•	Does this chapter describe siting and security measures for the IHF?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
10. Physical Security Plan.			
• Does this chapter describe the areas of security interest related to the site?			
• Does this chapter specify the equipment, forces, and devices used to protect RCWM?			
11. References.			
• Does the Work Plan include appropriate references?			
12. Appendices. Are the following documents included as appendices to the Work Plan:			
• SOW?			
• Site maps?			
• Points of contact?			
• Site Safety and Health Plan?			
 Environmental Sampling and Analysis Plan? (Refer to Table B-7 and EM 200-1-3) 			
• Forms?			
 MSD calculation sheets? 			
 Resumes for key personnel and personnel filling core labor categories, EOD school graduation certificates if applicable? 			
• Technical Project Planning Work Sheets?			

Table B-5. Geospatial Data Systems

Project Name:			
Project Location:			
MM DC Representative:			
Preparer's Name and Title:			
Date of Preparation:			
	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
1. Locating of Existing Geospatial Data:			
• Types?			
• Accuracy?			
2. Newly Collected Geospatial Data:			
• Types?			
• Accuracy?			
• Location?			
3. Proposed System Methods and Procedures:			
• Hardware and Software?			
• Personnel?			
• Work Instructions/Data Format?			
• Data Processing?			
• Analysis Support?			
• Communication/Data Transfer?			
• Data Storage?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
4.	Quality Control:			
	• Data Validation?			
	 Quality control should be provided by the surveying contractor if used. 			
	 If the contractor is conducting the surveying themselves, documented quality control metrics should be used. Examples of possible metrics include: Specifying closure metrics on the survey Specifying backsight tolerances on angular closure (i.e., 15 sec for distance less than 100-feet, 10 sec. for longer distances) 			
5.	Interim Deliverables?			
6.	Final Deliverables?			
Pla	nning Considerations			
1.	Spatial Reference System:			
2.	Existing Control Markers:			
	• Density?			
	• Accuracy?			
	• Accessibility?			
3.	Project and Grid Controls (New):			
	• Requirements?			
	• Material?			
	• Location?			
	• Construction?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
	• Identification?			
	• Accuracy?			
4.	Proposed Methods and Procedures:			
	• Equipment?			
	• Personnel?			
	• Safety?			
	• Work Instruction?			
	• Data Processing?			
	• Production Rates?			
5.	QC:			
	• Instrument Calibration?			
	• Data Validation?			
6.	Interim Reporting?			
Ele	ectronic Submittal			
1.	Are disks readable?			
2.	Are the disks labeled and dated?			
3.	Are the files in the correct format, as requested in SOW? (e.g., DOS, Win 95/98/NT, UNIX, etc.)			
4.	Do they follow the SDSFIE, if required?			
5.	Are all of the detailed files included on the disks to make a complete data set?			
6.	Is each individual file readable and useable?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
7.	Is the file located electronically (geospatially) at the correct location on the ground?			
8.	Is the coordinate system correct?			
9.	Are all files geographically located in the correct plane and datum?			
10.	Are the X, Y, and Z coordinates correct within the file?			
11.	Have the correct number of copies been submitted, depending on the submittal stage?			
<u>Pa</u>	per or Hard Copy Submittal			
1.	Is the sheet the requested size?			
2.	Does it contain a standard border?			
3.	Is the correct grid system and associated control shown on the sheet?			
4.	Has the title block been completed (i.e., all required blocks filled in)?			
5.	Is the sheet plotted at the scale shown in the title block?			
6.	Are there grid marks or tics (meters, feet, both, Lat/Lon, Local, etc.)?			
7.	Is there a North arrow (magnetic declination, true North, and grid North) and graphical scale shown on the sheet, both graphically and printed text?			
8.	Is there a legend for associated symbols on the sheet? Or, are all symbols used in a project shown on one legends and notes page?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
9. If the drawing is to be certified or stamped, are the correct seals, stamps, and signatures contained on the sheet and legible?			
10. Is the state registration seal and associated state registration number shown on the sheet?			
11. Are all the sheets plotted and an index sheet prepared to make a complete set of drawings to convey a completed mapping product?			
12. Are all sheets numbered in a sequential order in the set?			
13. Are all sheets included in the set?			
14. Have the correct number of copies been submitted?			
15. Are boundaries of required removal or remediation areas shown?			
16. Are grids of areas investigated shown?			
17. Are the coordinates of grid corners shown on drawing or in a table?			
18. Was the GIS submittal required? If so:			
 Are all required databases and map layers submitted? 			
• Is the data submitted in the agreed-upon format (ArcView, Intergraph Modular GIS Environment [MGE], MapInfo, etc.)?			
• Is the Users Manual modified for any project specific requirements or software modification from the standard?			

Table B-6. Geophysical Investigations Checklist

Project Name: Project Location:			
MM DC Representative:			
Preparer's Name and Title:			
Date of Preparation:			
	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Geophysical Planning Considerations:			
I. Is the geophysical planning being performed by or under the supervision of a "qualified" geophysicist?			
2. Have objectives been considered for the geophysical investigation in the following areas:			
• Analog Geophysical surveying (Mag and Dig)?			
• Digital Geophysical mapping?			
• Geophysical interrogation?			
3. Has the geophysical investigation planning process been addressed:			
• Experienced personnel?			
• Geophysical systems?			
• Analysis procedures?			
 Navigational accuracy and precision? 			
Geophysical Instrument Considerations:			
Were the following factors which affect geophysical systems been considered:			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
 Military munition composition? 			
• Military munition size?			
• MEC depth?			
Military munition fuzing?			
• Background interference from metallic scrap?			
Soil composition and geology?			
• Vegetation and terrain?			
• Cultural features?			
Selection of Geophysical Systems			
1. Which type of geophysical instrument is most appropriate:			
• Active (TDEM or FDEM)?			
• Passive (magnetometer or gradiometer)?			
MEC Detection Capabilities			
1. Have the following factors been considered in determining the detection capabilities in the field for a geophysical instrument?			
• Vegetation?			
• Terrain?			
Geologic noise/gradients?			
• Cultural noise?			
• Munitions debris?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
 MEC penetration beyond detection? 			
• QA items detected?			
MEC Detection Depths			
1. Have maximum MEC detection depths been estimated in accordance with Table 6.1?			
2. Has the maximum possible depth of MEC at the site been estimated?			
Geophysical Systems and Electric Fuze Safety			
Have the following safety precautions been applied to the project?	e		
1. Passive Systems:			
• Are the passive systems being used in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions?			
2. Active Systems:			
 Prior to using an active instrument, has the operator determined if any fuzing systems exist at the sites that contain any electrical components? 			
• If a MEC site does not contain electrical fuzes, are the active systems being used IAW the manufacturer's instruction?			
• Has the latest version of the Active EMI Effect on Electronic Fuzes been reviewed to determine the expected effect of the instrumentation on fuzes suspected to be on-site?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
	• If a MEC site does contain or is reasonably expected to contain electrical fuzes, has the instrument operator submitted a request for a waiver from the Design Center Safety Manager?			
Aı	nalysis Software			
1.	Has the appropriate analysis software been selected for the specific instrument?			
2.	Prior to using the software, have navigation adjustments been made?			
3.	Are the data in the correct, project-specific coordinate system?			
4.	Are the geophysical data in the units specified by the software's instruction manual?			
Na	avigation System			
	1. Which type of coordinate system was selected:			
	• Temporary (local coordinate system)?			
	• Permanent (UTM or State Plane)?			
	2. What type of positional system was used?			
	Line and Fiducial			
	DGPS			
	 Laser Based RTS 			
	Ultrasonic	-		
	■ RF			
	Other			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
3. Are there sufficient horizontal and vertical control points and/or bench marks at the project site?	,		
• Are the accuracies of the control point/bench mark coordinates sufficient for the needs of the selected positioning system?			
• Are the coordinates of the control points/bench marks available in the project-specific coordinate system?			
• Have the limitations (or assumptions) of the selected positioning system(s) been considered and evaluated against their intended use?			
GPO Planning			
1. Have DQOs been developed?			
2. Has a Work Plan been developed for the prove-out?			
3. Does the GPO Work Plan describe the following:			
• GPO grid location and construction?			
 Factors influencing prove-out grid location and construction: 			
 Terrain, vegetation, geological conditions? 			
Proximity to the field site?			
 Isolation from overhead power lines, radio transmitters, underground utilities, etc? 			
The establishment of project specific QC measures and metrics for selected detection and navigation instruments as well as processing and interpretation methods?			

		$\underline{\mathbf{Y}}$	<u>N</u>	N/A
	Convenient access?			
	 Likelihood that the area will be disturbed during use? 			
	– Rights-of-Entry?			
	 Possibility of pre-existing buried MEC? 			
•	Pre-Seeding geophysical mapping?			
•	Have the following items been considered regarding pre-seeding:			
	Size and configuration?			
	Survey accuracy?			
	- Layout?			
	- Seeded items?			
	Depths and orientations?			
	– Cultural interference?			
	– Munitions debris interference?			
•	Data collection variables, including:			
	– Instrument height?			
	– Instrument orientation?			
	– Direction of travel?			
	– Measurement interval?			
	– Lane width?			
•	Data analysis and interpretation?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
• Data evaluation?				
• Selection of detection systems?				
 Establish project specific QC n metrics for the selected detection 				
Geophysical Investigation Plan				
 Does the Geophysical Investigation W following: 	ork Plan address the			
• Site Description:				
 Geophysical DQO measured well as their frequencies requirements? 				
 Specific Area(s) to be in including a Survey Miss 				
 Past, current and future 	use?			
 Anticipated MEC type, quantity? 	composition and			
Depth anticipated?				
 Digital Topographic Ma 	ps?			
– Vegetation?				
 Geologic conditions (in type, mineralization and 				
 Soil conditions (including type/composition, typic and thickness)? 				

			<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
	-	Surface water conditions (does area to be surveyed include ponds, lakes, streams or shallow water coastlines?)			
	_	Man-made features potentially affecting geophysical investigations?			
	-	Site-specific dynamic events such as tides, unusually strong winds, or other unusual factors affecting site operations?			
	_	Overall Site Accessibility and Impediments?			
	_	Potential Worker Hazards?			
•	Geopl	nysical Investigation Methods:			
	_	Survey Type?			
	_	Equipment?			
	_	Procedures?			
	_	Personnel?			
	_	Production Rates?			
	_	Data Spatial Density?			
					-
•	Instru	ment Standardization:			
	_	Instrument drift?			
	_	Standardization procedures?			
	_	Abbreviated standardization checks?			
	_	Instrument response to a known standard?			
•	Data I	Processing, Correction and Analysis:			

	$\underline{\mathbf{Y}}$	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Instrument drift correction?			
Diurnal drift correction?			
Digital filtering and enhancement?			
Anomaly selection process?			
 Correlation with ground truth? 			
• Dig Sheet Development?			
• Anomaly Reacquisition?			
• Feedback Process?			
• Quality Control?			
• Corrective Measures?			
• Records Management?			
• Interim Reporting?			
• Map Format?			
Sectorization			
1. When defining sectors, were the following factors considered?			
• Former military use?			
Anticipated MEC type?			
• Anticipated MEC distribution?			
• Terrain and vegetation?			
• Current land use?			

	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
• Natural and cultural boundaries?			
Surveying within a Sector			
1. Which surveying methodology is appropriate for the sector:			
• 100 percent surveying?			
 Biased surveying?(Increased data density in areas of interest) 			
• Probability surveying?			
• If probability surveying is selected, which type of strategy will be used in the sector:			
Random pattern grid surveying?			
Hybrid surveying?			
– Transect surveying?			
Meandering path surveying?			
Geophysical Data Acquisition			
1. Are SOPs provided for all processes and procedures associated with the geophysical data acquisition program?			
Excavating Anomalies within a Grid			
1. Which methodology for selecting anomalies for excavation is appropriate for the grid?			
• 100 percent anomaly excavation?			
• Statistical anomaly excavation?			
• 100% having predefined anomaly characteristics with statistical sampling of all others.			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Da	ata Interpretation			
1.	Was the geophysical data interpreted after the geophysical investigation?			
2.	Were the project objectives met?			
Gε	eophysical Anomaly Dig Sheets			
1.	Are standard operating procedures (SOPs) provided for all processes and procedures associated with the geophysical mapping program?			
2.	Are the frequencies and reporting needs of the quality control measures included in the geophysical mapping plan?			
3.	Do the dig sheets contain the following information:			
	• Project site?			
	• Grid number?			
	• Anomaly number?			
	• Name of the geophysical contractor?			
	• Name of the responsible field geophysicist?			
	• Date geophysical mapping occurred?			
	• Name of the responsible analyst?			
	• Date the data was geophysically analyzed?			
	 Predicted location coordinates? 			
	• Predicted depth to top of item (optional)?			
	• Comments.			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
Ar	nomaly Reacquisition and Marking			
1.	Was the same type of instrument used for reacquisition as that used in the geophysical survey? (Does the instrument used in reacquisition measure the same property (magnetic field or conductivity) as the original instrument? No contacts should still be investigated using the original instrument. If a similar, but not the same instrument is used in reacquisition, a method for checking anomaly amplitudes between the two similar instruments must be developed and documented.			
2.	Were discrepancies between the re-acquired locations of anomalies as shown on the dig-sheet and final excavated location recorded and included in the geophysical report?			
3.	Were discrepancies between the anomaly amplitudes recorded on the digsheet and the anomaly amplitudes recorded during the reacquisition resolved and recorded on the digsheet?			
Ar	nomaly Excavation			
1.	Was the following post-excavation information collected?			
	• Project site?			
	• Grid number?			
	Anomaly number?			
	• Excavation contractor?			
	• Name of the responsible OE Safety Specialist?			
	• Date of excavation?			
	• Final excavated location coordinates?			
	• Weather conditions?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
	• Anomaly identification?			
	• Actual depth to top of item?			
	• Soil type?			
	• Actual length (optional)?			
	• Actual diameter (optional)?			
	• Actual azimuth (optional)?			
	• Item material composition (optional)?			
	• Comments.			
<u>Di</u>	gital Data Format and Storage			
1.	Were the requirements and standards for a digital data management system tailored for the specific ordnance investigative needs of the project?			
2.	Has the geophysical data been stored in a format and media that permits loading, storage and use of GIS workstations without modification or additional software?			
Qι	uality Management			
1.	Were all of the quality control measures and metrics met?			
	• If not all measures and metrics were met, for those that failed, were root-cause analyses performed and corrective actions taken?			
2.	Were procedures for product quality management followed for:			
	• Delivering a completed, cleared Grid?			
	• Producing a completed investigation report?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
•	Producing a completed GPO report with the specified as-built details?			
•	Delivering completed dig sheets?			
•	Delivering properly formatted and documented raw and final geophysical data?			
•	Including complete and legible maps of the data and interpretations			

Table B-7. Munitions Constituents Sampling Checklist

Project Name:			
Project Location:			
MM DC Representative:			
Preparer's Name and Title:			
Date of Preparation:			
	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Objective</u>			
Has the objective for the munitions response investigation been identified?			
Initial MC Investigation Planning			
Has the MC investigation system employed the following components:			
• Experienced personnel?			-
• Experienced laboratory (e.g., NELAP accreditation and DoD QSM compliance self-declaration)?			
Navigational accuracy and precision?			
Sampling and Analysis Considerations			
Have the following factors been considered for sampling and analysis:			
• MEC depth?			
• MEC composition?			
Background conditions?			
Regulatory requirements?			
Sampling and Analysis Plan			
1. Has the SAP been prepared prior to initiating field activities?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
2.	Has the SAP been prepared IAW ER 1110-1-263, and EM 200-1-3?			
3.	Are the Laboratory QA/QC plan and applicable Standard Operating Procedures included in the SAP?			
4.	Has the SAP submitted to PM and MM DC been approved?			
	ta Interpretation, Validation, Reporting, and Decision king			
Ha me	ve the requirements outlined in Section 7-8 been t?			
Qu	ality Management			
1.	Has the QC of the various analytical tasks been provided?			
2.	Have the handling and custody requirements for all QC samples been administered?			
Ele	ectronic Data Deliverables			
1.	Has EDD been specified in SOW?			
2.	Is implementation included in the Work Plan?			
3.	If ADR (or similar EDD) specified, does Work Plan address automated portions of data review?			

Table B-8. Blast and Fragmentation Protection Review Checklist

Pr	oject Name:			
	oject Location:			
	M DC Representative:			
Re	eviewer's Name and Title:			
Da	ate of Review:			
		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
En	gineering Considerations for SOW Preparation			
1.	Has the SOW properly taken into account the physical characteristics of the site?			
2.	Has the SOW taken into account the type of munitions response being contemplated?			
3.	Has the SOW taken into account the characteristics of the probable MEC items that will be encountered at the site?			
4.	Has the correct MGFD been identified for the site?			
M	inimum Separation Distances			
1.	Are there MSDs being proposed for the site?			
2.	Have the following criteria for an unintentional detonation been evaluated:			
	 MSD for unintentional detonations: Which will provide the greatest distance? 			
	Overpressure at a K value of 50?			
	– Maximum fragmentation distance?			
	- 200 feet?			
	• Team Separation Distance: Which will provide the greatest distance?			
	Overpressure at a K value of 50?			
	- 1/600 distance?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
	• If the 1/600 distance is being used:			
	 Has justification been provided? 			
	 Has approval been given by the MM CXCX? 			
3.	Have the following criteria for an intentional detonation been evaluated:			
	• MSD: Which will provide the greatest distance?			
	– Maximum fragmentation distance?			
	Overpressure at a K value of 328?			
	- 200 feet?			
<u>Ex</u>	plosives Siting Plan Review Considerations			
1.	Has a map been included with the Explosives Siting Plan and is it at an appropriate scale?			
2.	Does the map identify the MRSs, the location for the explosives storage magazine, and any planned or established demolition areas?			
3.	Has the MRS been properly identified and has an appropriate MSD been calculated for the area?			
4.	Have the Q-D arcs for the MRS been drawn from the outermost edge of each area?			
5.	Has the proposed explosives storage magazine been properly sited?			
6.	Has the proposed demolition area been properly sited?			
7.	Have footprint areas for any Blow-in-Place areas, Collection Points, or In-Grid Consolidated Shots been discussed in the Explosives Safety Plan?			
8.	Has an appropriate team separation distance been identified between intrusive investigation teams in the Explosives Safety Plan?			
9.	Have any engineering controls been proposed in the Explosives Safety Plan?			
10.	Does the CDC have a DDESB-approved siting plan for the site, if a CDC is to be used?			

		<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	N/A
	gineering Controls for Unintentional/Accidental tonations			
	rricades. The PDT will consider the following elements garding barricade selection:			
	• Have barricades been specified for the project?			
	• Has the correct barricade been specified for the application IAW the DOD standards?			
	• If the proposed barricade has not been previously approved, has a complete structural design package been submitted to the MM CXCX?			
	• Has the design package been forwarded through appropriate channels to DDESB for review?			
<u>En</u>	gineering Controls for Intentional Detonations			
1.	Is soil being proposed as an engineering control for an intentional detonation?			
2.	Has the amount of soil to be placed on top of the MEC been properly calculated?			
3.	Are sandbags being proposed as an engineering control to limit the fragmentation and overpressure from an intentional MEC detonation?			
4.	Has the amount of sandbags being proposed been properly calculated based on the type of MEC to be destroyed?			
5.	Is a water barrier being proposed as an engineering control for an intentional detonation?			
6.	Have the requirements for water barricades detailed in HNC-ED-CS-S-00-3 been followed?			
7.	Has a CDC been specified for use on the site?			
8.	Is the CDC capable of safely containing the blast and fragmentation effects of the MEC to be found at the site?			

Table B-9. Munitions Constituents Sampling Checklist

Project Name:			
Project Location:			
MM DC Representative:			
Preparer's Name and Title:			
Date of Preparation:			
	V	N	NI/A
Objective	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Has the objective for the munitions response investigation			
been identified?			
Initial MC Investigation Planning			
Has the MC investigation system employed the			
following components:			
Experienced personnel?			
Experienced laboratory?			
Navigational accuracy and precision?			
Sampling and Analysis Considerations			
Have the following factors been considered for sampling			
and analysis:			
• MEC depth?			
• MEC composition?			
Background conditions?			
• Regulatory requirements?			
regulatory requirements.			
	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Sampling and Analysis Plan			
1. Has the SAP been prepared prior to initiating field			
activities?			
2. Has the SAP been prepared IAW ER 1110-1-263, ER 200-3-1, and EM 200-1-3?			
3. Are the Laboratory QA/QC plan and applicable	-		
Standard Operating Procedures included in the SAP?			
4. Has the SAP submitted to PM and MM DC been			
approved?			
			-

	EM 1110-1-4009 15 Jun 07		
Data Interpretation, Validation, Reporting, and Decision			
Making			
Have the requirements outlined in Section 7.8 been met?			
Quality Management			
1. Has the QC of the various analytical tasks been			
provided?			
2. Have the handling and custody requirements for all			
QC samples been administered?			
Electronic Data Deliverables			
1. Has EDD been specified in SOW/PWS?			
2. Is implementation included in the Work Plan?			
3. If SEDD (or similar EDD) specified, does Work Plan			
address automated portions of data review?			

EM 1110-1-4009 15 Jun 07

This page intentionally left blank